REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Claims 1 and 20 are independent. Independent claims 9, 12 and 16 and their respective dependent claims, as well as the other canceled claims, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In general, the claim amendments herein have been made merely to expedite the prosecution of the present Application Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the current Office Action.

Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interviews afforded to the Applicant's representative on November 30, 2007 and December 4, 2007. The Examiner and the Applicant's representative discussed the details of the claim amendments herein. The Examiner indicated that the claims as amended likely overcome the rejections of record.

If there are any outstanding issues involving the instant Application after the Examiner considers this Response, the Examiner is asked to please contact the Applicant's representative to determine if a resolution can be reached.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 20-23, and 25-26 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Sullivan does not disclose at least the emphasized subject matter from below-reproduced claims 1 and 20.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A method for reporting errors in an application, the method comprising:
>
> generating an error message box upon determination that an error occurred, the generation of the error message box by way of an error handling mechanism engaged upon determination that the error occurred;
>
> *generating a universal resource locator (URL) associated with the error, the URL including at least one string for use by product support*;
>
> *displaying the error message box, the error message box including the URL therein*;
>
> *connecting to product support in response to selection of the URL in the error message box*;
>
> passing the at least one string to the product support, the string including an error message identifier corresponding to information concerning the error; and
>
> *matching the error message identifier to the information concerning the error*. (Emphasis added.)

The Office maintains that Sullivan generates the same type of error message box as that set forth in the rejected claim, but this conclusion is not supported by Sullivan. Instead, Sullivan discloses that an *error message* may be displayed when an application encounters an error. (*See col. 7, lines 45 - 50.*) Sullivan does not disclose that the error message is part of an "error message box" that includes a URL therein, as is recited by claim 1. The Office also maintains that Sullivan discloses "connecting to product support in response to selection of the URL," as is recited in claim 1. This conclusion also appears incorrect. Instead, Sullivan discloses connecting to a support server in response to a user clicking on an icon, where the user is obliged to do so after a program shows an error. Finally, Sullivan does not disclose at least the "generating" and "matching"

acts recited in claim 1. Specifically, Applicant has carefully considered Sullivan and finds nothing that discloses the indicated acts of claim 1.

Sullivan discloses technology capable of reporting application errors by way of a guided self-help methodology. The technology disclosed by Sullivan is designed to enable a user to find an answer associated with an application error with increased and higher reliability.

In general, the Sullivan technology includes self-help methodology that is first enabled by a user after the occurrence of an application error. The application error is reported in line item format (e.g., wwwint132.dll error). (*See column 7, lines 47 - 50.*) The application error is not reported in an error message box, as in claim 1. Furthermore, Sullivan does not report an application error with a URL that enables a user to contact product support. In distinction, the error message box of claim 1 includes a URL.

The Office maintains that Sullivan generates the same type of error message box as that set forth in rejected claim. Applicant has carefully considered Sullivan and has come to the conclusion that the Office has incorrectly interpreted the document. Specifically, Sullivan discloses that an *error message* may be displayed when an application encounters an error. (*See col. 7, lines 45 - 50.*) The Office asserts that this disclosure is the same as the generated "error message box" recited by rejected claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits the mere generation of an error message is not the same as generating a error message box that is enabled to contain additional information (e.g., a URL) that may be of assistance to a user.

The Office also maintains that Sullivan discloses "connecting to product support in response to selection of the URL in the error message box." The Office asserts that the foregoing subject matter of rejected claim 1 is disclosed at *column 8, lines 30 - 32 and lines 52 - 67*. The specified portion of Sullivan discloses that an HTTP request may be made to an automated technical support server. This request is sent after a user initiates a request for technical support by way of double-clicking an icon and once a selection is made related to a number of possible "problem areas." The Office is respectfully requested to refer to *column 7, lines 55 - 68*. This disclosure of Sullivan clearly shows that a URL is not selected from an error message box. Instead, Sullivan discloses making the HTTP connection once a problem area is selected. Sullivan does not disclose or suggest that the problem areas are URL links.

Column 8, lines 52 - 67, describes self-help information that is available to a user after the user has initiated self-help by way of an icon displayed in a user interface associated with an operating system. The self-help information described in this portion of Sullivan is not part of an error reporting initiated as the result of an application failure.

Regarding the "generating" and "matching" acts recited in claim 1, the Applicant reiterates that careful review of Sullivan shows that these acts are not disclosed.

According to the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose at least the discussed limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2 and 4-7 depend from claim 1. The rejection with regard to these claims should be withdrawn by virtue of the dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, are not disclosed by Sullivan.

Claim 20, as amended, recites:

> A computer storage medium having stored therein instructions for performing acts for creating an error message, the acts comprising:
>
> generating an error message box upon determination that an error occurred, the generation of the error message box by way of an error handling mechanism engaged upon determination that the error occurred;
>
> *generating a universal resource locator (URL) associated with the error, the URL including at least one string for use by product support;*
>
> *displaying the error message box, the error message box including the URL therein;*
>
> *connecting to product support in response to selection of the URL in the error message box*;
>
> passing the at least one string to the product support, the string including an error message identifier corresponding to information concerning the error; and
>
> *matching the error message identifier to the information concerning the error*. (Emphasis added.)

The Office maintains that Sullivan generates the same type of error message box as that set forth in the rejected claim, but this conclusion is not supported by Sullivan. Instead, Sullivan discloses that an *error message* may be displayed when an application encounters an error. (*See col. 7, lines 45 - 50.*) Sullivan does not disclose that the error message is part of an "error message box" that includes an URL therein, as is recited by claim 20. The Office also maintains that Sullivan discloses "connecting to product support in response to selection of the URL," as is recited in claim 20. This conclusion also appears incorrect.

Instead, Sullivan discloses connecting to a support server in response to a user clicking on an icon, where the user is obliged to do so after a program shows an error. Finally, Sullivan does not disclose at least the "generating" and "matching" acts recited in claim 20. Specifically, Applicant has carefully considered Sullivan and finds nothing that discloses the indicated acts of claim 20.

Additional details concerning the deficiencies of Sullivan are given hereinabove, and such discussion may be applied to claim 20, as well. The Office is respectfully requested to consider the above discussion.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 20.

Dependent claims 21 and 23-26 depend from claim 20. The rejection with regard to these claims should be withdrawn by virtue of the dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 20, are not disclosed by Sullivan.

Claim Rejections Under U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 24 stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Sullivan in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030185368 to Bradfield et al. (hereinafter "Bradfield"). **Claims 9 and 10** stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Sullivan in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030074607 to Brundridge et al. (hereinafter "Brundridge"). **Claims 12-14 and 16-19** stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Sullivan in view of Brundridge, and further in view of U.S.

Patent Publication No. 20030185368 to Bradfield et al. (hereinafter "Bradfield"). **Claims 11 and 15** stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Sullivan in view of Brundridge, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,048 to Carpenter et al. (hereinafter "Carpenter"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As to the rejections of **claims 9-11 and 12-19**, these rejections are moot in view of the cancelation of the claims without prejudice or disclaimer. As to the rejection of **claims 5 and 24**, these claims depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively, and hence incorporate the features of respective claims 1 and 20. As noted above, Sullivan fails to disclose limitations of claims 1 and 20. The added disclosure of Bradfield does not remedy those shortcomings, nor does the rejection make any assertion to that effect. Therefore, the proposed combination of Sullivan in view of Bradfield fails to suggest the recitation of claims 1 and 20, from which claims 5 and 24 depend, respectively. Moreover, these dependent claims recite features that, when taken together with those of their respective independent claim, are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Sullivan in view of Bradfield.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact either of the attorneys listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Jan 30, 2008

By: /Tim R. Wyckoff, Reg. No. 46,175/

David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222

Tim R. Wyckoff
Reg. No. 46,175
Email: wyc_law@live.com